

comments should focus on identifying specific social, economic, or environmental impacts to be evaluated, and suggesting alternatives that are less costly or less environmentally damaging which achieve similar objectives. Comments should focus on the issues and alternatives for analysis, and not on a preference for a particular alternative. Individual preference for a particular alternative should be communicated during the comment period for the Draft EIS.

If you wish to be placed on the mailing list to receive further information as the project continues, contact Mr. Andrew Brennan at the MBTA (see ADDRESSES above).

II. Description of Study Area and Project Need

The proposed project consists of an approximately 3 mile rail tunnel linking North and South Stations in Boston, Massachusetts. The northern tunnel portals will be located to the north of the Gilmore Bridge and west of the I-93 highway viaduct in Somerville, Massachusetts. There will be two southern tunnel portals: one on the southern side of the Massachusetts Turnpike between Harrison and Shawmut Avenues, and the other in the vicinity of the railroad yard south of the West Fourth Street Bridge in South Boston. Three underground passenger stations are proposed: (1) At the existing South Station, (2) near the MBTA Blue Line adjacent to the Aquarium Station, and (3) between Haymarket and North Stations. The project will also define options for creating regional MBTA rail service by combining the two currently separate north and south side commuter rail networks.

The construction of the rail link tunnel will close the gap in intercity rail service along the Atlantic seaboard, and will create a unified rail system for metropolitan Boston by combining the two currently separate north and south side commuter rail networks. This will reduce rapid transit system congestion in downtown Boston, increase operational capacity at South Station, and improve regional air quality by diverting automobile trips to the rail system.

III. Alternatives

The alternatives proposed for evaluation include: (1) No-action, which involves no change to existing rail facilities at North and South Stations,

(2) construction of a rail link tunnel connecting North and South Stations along the Central Artery alignment. A two-track and a four-track tunnel option will be considered, and

(3) a transportation system management alternative that will be identified during the scoping process.

Although the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has elected to pursue the North-South Rail Link corridor within the Central Artery alignment, the FTA is interested in receiving comments regarding whether a rail link along the Congress Street alignment should be included in the MIS.

IV. Probable Effects

FTA and the MBTA will evaluate all significant environmental, social, and economic impacts of the alternatives analyzed in the EIS. Impacts include changes in the natural environment (air and water quality, rare and endangered species), changes in the social environment (land use and neighborhoods, noise and vibration, aesthetics, park lands, historic/archeological resources), disposal of excavated material, public safety and changes in rail service and patronage. An operational analysis of combined north and south side commuter rail networks will be performed and project capital and operating costs and revenues will be estimated. The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long term period of operation, and financial information in support of the MIS will be provided. Measures to mitigate significant adverse impacts will also be addressed.

Issued on: March 2, 1995.

Richard H. Doyle,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-5587 Filed 3-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 92-50; Notice 4]

Autokraft Ltd.; Grant of Application for Renewal of Temporary Exemption From Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208

Autokraft Limited of Weybridge, Surrey, England, applied for a renewal of NHTSA Exemption No. 92-6, exempting its AC MkIV until January 1, 1995, from compliance with paragraph S4.1.4 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*. The basis of the application was that compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried to comply with the standard in good faith.

Notice of receipt of the application was published on December 19, 1994,

and an opportunity afforded for comment (59 FR 65428).

Autokraft was granted NHTSA Exemption No. 92-6 on December 21, 1992 (57 FR 60563), and its exemption from S4.1.4 of Standard No. 208 was scheduled to expire on January 1, 1995. Because the application for renewal of the exemption was filed "not later than 60 days before the termination date" (in this instance, October 27, 1994), the termination date has been stayed until the Administrator has acted upon the application (49 CFR 555.8(e)).

The applicant sought a further two-year exemption for its AC Mk IV passenger car, of which it has produced 15 in the year preceding the filing of its application. Although the company had projected sales of 150 units in the United States in the years 1992-94, in fact, there were only seven sales. According to its application, Autokraft "has continued the process of researching and developing the installation of a driver and passenger side airbag system" but "we have been unable to achieve the fitting of a suitable system mainly due to the chassis design being based upon a classic 1960's design and not easily adaptable to suit air bag installation." The delay is also due to "the project having insufficient funds generated by sales and available for completing the development."

Autokraft concluded that the adaptation of an existing automatic restraint system is the only viable alternative. Its continuation of compliance efforts has given it "significant knowledge into the areas of vehicle modification, computer simulation, design rough road testing and low, medium and high speed crash testing." Complicating its efforts is the need to use a different engine and transmission after October 1, 1995, and the possible effect that this will have upon compliance. It estimated the cost to achieve conformance would be \$550,000, achievable by spreading these costs during the exemption period. Autokraft reported losses totalling 3,308,243 Pounds Sterling (approximately \$5,624,000 at a rate of \$1.70/1) for the years 1992-93, and projected a further loss for 1994.

The company argued that an exemption would be in the public interest and consistent with the objectives of motor vehicle safety because it meets all applicable EEC standards, and all U.S. Federal motor vehicle safety standards with the exception of the automatic restraint requirements of Standard No. 208 (its 3-point driver and passenger restraints meet the previous requirements). The production of the car makes available to

the public "at a realistic price" a replica of the original AC Cobra vehicle produced from the original AC Cobra tooling, manufactured during the 1960's predominantly for the American market. Autokraft is in the process of finalizing a U.S. distribution agreement and showed the car at the North American International Auto Show in Detroit in January 1995.

The applicant believes that it will comply with Standard No. 208 six months before January 1, 1997, when the 2-year extension of its exemption that it has requested would expire.

No comments were received on the petition.

Review of the application for renewal shows continued existence of the net loss position of the applicant upon which the agency first found that compliance would cause substantial economic hardship. The fact that only seven cars were sold in the United States under the previous two-year exemption demonstrates that the U.S. specification MkIV could not contribute to a significant offset of Autokraft's net losses. The examples on display at the Detroit Show were reported to have a suggested price of \$95,000 each, making it unlikely that the applicant will increase its sales by a significant number of vehicles, even if it can enter a U.S. distribution agreement. The car, an open 2-seater, is of limited utility. NHTSA notes that the company's efforts to comply have been made more difficult by the vehicle's 1960's configuration, but that the company believes that it will be in a position to manufacture a fully-conforming vehicle by July 1996, thus it has not requested the maximum exemption of 3 years to which it would be entitled under the hardship provisions. NHTSA also recognizes that the MkIV is certified as meeting all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards except for S4.1.4 of Standard No. 208, and that each of its passenger positions is equipped with a three-point restraint system of a type that previously was sufficient to meet Standard No. 208's requirements for passenger cars. It is in the public interest that a variety of motor vehicles continue to be provided. Sales, even though small in number, will make a positive contribution to the economy through the employment afforded through the distribution, sales, and repair channels.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby found that compliance with Standard No. 208 would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that tried to comply with the standard in good faith. It is hereby further found that an exemption is

consistent with the public interest and 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301—*Motor Vehicle Safety*. Accordingly, NHTSA Temporary Exemption No. 92-6 from paragraph S4.1.4. of 49 CFR 571.208 Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection* is extended to January 1, 1997.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30113; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: March 2, 1995.

Ricardo Martinez,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-5690 Filed 3-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

Art Advisory Panel—Notice of Closed Meeting

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of closed meeting of Art Advisory Panel.

SUMMARY: Closed meeting of the Art Advisory Panel will be held in Washington, DC.

DATES: The meeting will be held March 29 and 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The closed meeting of the Art Advisory Panel will be held on March 29 and 30, 1995 in room 118, beginning at 9:30 a.m., Aerospace Center Building, 901 D Street SW., Washington, DC 20024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen Carolan, CC:AP:AS:4 901 D Street SW., Washington, DC 20024. Telephone (202) 401-4128, (not a toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. (1988), that a closed meeting of the Art Advisory Panel will be held on March 29 and 30, 1995 in room 118 beginning at 9:30 a.m., Aerospace Center Building, 901 D Street SW., Washington, DC 20024.

The agenda will consist of the review and evaluation of the acceptability of fair market value appraisals of works of art involved in federal income, estate, or gift tax returns. This will involve the discussion of material in individual tax returns made confidential by the provisions of section 6103 of Title 26 of the United States Code.

A determination as required by section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act has been made that this meeting is concerned with matters listed in section 552b(c) (3), (4), (6), and (7) of

Title 5 of the United States Code, and that the meeting will not be open to the public.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has determined that this document is not a significant regulatory action as defined in Executive Order 12866 and that a regulatory impact analysis therefore is not required. Neither does this document constitute a rule subject to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. Chapter 6).

Margaret Milner Richardson,

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

[FR Doc. 95-5675 Filed 3-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Information Collection Under OMB Review: Other On-the-Job Training Agreement and Apprenticeship Training Agreement and Standards, VA Form 22-8864, and Employer's Application to Provide Job Training, VA Form 22-8865

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.
ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has submitted to OMB the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). This document lists the following information: (1) The title of the information collection, and the Department form number(s); if applicable; (2) a description of the need and its use; (3) who will be required or asked to respond; (4) an estimate of the total annual reporting hours, and recordkeeping burden, if applicable; (5) the estimated average burden hours per respondent; (6) the frequency of response; and (7) an estimated number of respondents.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the proposed information collection and supporting documents may be obtained from Trish Fineran, Veterans Benefits Administration (20M30), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20420, (202) 273-6886.

Comments and questions about the items on the list should be directed to VA's OMB Desk Officer, Joseph Lackey, NEOB, Room 3002, Washington, DC 20503, (202) 395-7316. Do not send requests for benefits to this address.

DATES: Comments on the information collection should be directed to the OMB Desk Officer by no later than April 7, 1995.

Dated: February 28, 1995.